



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RECENT IMPORTANT DECISIONS

ACCRETION—TITLE TO NEW LAND—ENCROACHMENT OF WATERCOURSE UPON LANDS BEYOND.—D's lands were bounded on the east by a river and on the west by the land of P. By erosion the river slowly shifted until all of D's tract was washed away as well as part of P's holding. The river then slowly receded and the land of P was built up as was also new land east of the former boundary of P and D. P brings an action to quiet title for the land newly formed. *Held*, title to the land in dispute rested in P. *Yearsley v. Gipple*, (Nebr., 1919) 175 N. W. 641.

D, though accepting the general principal of accretion, contended that the doctrine did not apply to lands the boundary of which is fixed and definite as in the case of property not originally riparian. This contention is not without authority. *Volcanic Oil and Gas Co. v. Chaplin*, 27 Ont. L. Rep. 34; *Allard v. Curran*, 168 N. W. 761; *Gilbert v. Eldridge*, 47 Minn. 210; *Ocean City Ass'n. v. Shriver*, 64 N. J. L. 550. This view however has been denied in the following cases: *Welles v. Bailey*, 55 Conn. 292; *Peuker v. Canter*, 62 Kan. 363; *Widdecomb v. Chiles*, 173 Mo. 195. The principal case follows the latter authorities and refuses to distinguish the case where the boundary is a fixed line and from it's very nature is unshiftable. Under this view land entirely landlocked may acquire the privileges and liabilities of riparian land by means of the action of the forces of nature. See 17 MICH. L. REV. 95; see also 26 HARV. L. REV. 185.

ADOPTION—DESCENT AND DISTRIBUTION IN RELATION TO AN ADOPTED CHILD.—An intestate left surviving him two sons of his deceased sister and an adopted son of his deceased brother. The adopted son claimed, by right of representation, one-half of the estate as heir of the intestate under § 3964, WYOMING COMPILED STATUTES, which provides, that an adopted child " * * * shall be entitled to the same rights of person and property as children or heirs at law of the persons thus adopting them, unless the rights of property should be excepted in the agreement of adoption." *Held*, that the adopted son was entitled to one-half of the estate. *In re Cadwell's Estate*, (Wyo., 1920), 186 Pac. 499.

Adoption was unknown to the common law, and hence, the legal status of an adopted child is determined entirely by statute. *Albring v. Ward*, 137 Mich. 352; PECK, DOMESTIC RELATIONS, § 106. The statutes generally provide that the adopted child may inherit from the adopting parents. *Morrison v. Sessions*, 70 Mich. 297; STIMSON, AM. ST. LAW, § 6647A. Although his right to inherit from his natural kindred is not thereby destroyed. *In re Darling's Estate*, 173 Cal. 221; 15 MICH. L. REV. 161. Since all the rights in favor of the adopted child exist solely by statute, it has generally been held, in the absence of special provision in the statute, that the adopted child cannot inherit from the kindred of the adopting parent. *Wallace v. Noland*, 246 Ill. 535, 545; *In re Leask*, 197 N. Y. 193. In accord with this view, and contrary